

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-referenced U.S. Patent application. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-25 are pending.

Claim Amendments

Applicants submit that the amendments to the claims above were in no way motivated by the prior art, and were merely to correct informalities. Therefore, Applicants submit that these claim amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of the claims for estoppel or other claim construction purposes.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-8, 11-23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,533,025 issued to Fleek et al. (*Fleek*). Applicants submit that these claims are not rendered obvious by *Fleek* for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 4-7

Claim 1 recites the following:

a communication device establishing a wireless communication session with a remote user terminal, the wireless communication session having associated therewith a first session time limit;
the communication device **detecting a session renewal**; and
the communication device **altering the first session time limit** in response to detecting the session renewal.

Thus, Applicants claim detecting a renewal of a wireless communication session and altering the session time limit in response to detecting the session renewal.

Fleek discusses using a random time delay to determine the length of a backoff period before retransmitting a packet for which an acknowledgement is not received. See col. 5, lines

29-31 and 48-63. *Fleek* fails to disclose detecting a session renewal. It appears that the Office Action attempts to equate *Fleek*'s acknowledgement timeout to the session time limit recited in claim 1: Applicants respectfully submit that this represents a misunderstanding of the technology at issue. An acknowledgement timeout may or may not end a session. Systems are often set up to attempt to retransmit a packet over the communication channel when an acknowledgement timeout occurs, as in *Fleek*. Thus, the session does not end, because with an acknowledgement timeout the remote station still has rights to access the communication channel over which it was communicating, whereas a session lapse ends such rights. Even assuming that an acknowledgement timeout could be construed as a session time limit, which Applicants maintain that it cannot be so construed, *Fleek* fails to disclose or suggest that a session renewal takes place. Therefore, *Fleek* fails to anticipate claim 1 because it fails to disclose or suggest at least one limitation of claim.

Claims 4-7 depend from claim 1. Because dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that these claims are not anticipated by *Fleek* for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 8 and 11-14

Claim 8 recites the following:

a communication device providing a session to a remote user terminal, the session having associated therewith a first session time limit;
upon lapse of the first session time limit, the communication device determining whether a session renewal has been generated; and
the communication device, if having **determined that a session renewal has been generated**, renewing the session for a second session time limit, and if having determined that a session renewal has not been generated, terminating the session.

Thus, Applicants claim renewing a communication session for a second session time limit if, upon lapse of a first session time limit, it is determined that a session renewal has been generated.

As set forth above, Fleek fails to disclose or suggest either lapse of a session time limit or determining if a session renewal has been generated. Therefore, Fleek cannot anticipate the invention as recited in claim 8. Claims 11-14 depend from claim 8, and thus necessarily include the limitations of claim 8. Therefore, Fleek fails to anticipate these claims for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 8.

Claims 15-23 and 25

Claim 15 recites the following:

a session lifespan means for **providing a time limit to a communication session** with an external device, the communication session characterized by an ability of the external device to have access to wireless communication channels for exchanging data; and
a session management means for **altering the time limit in response to a predetermined condition.**

Thus, Applicants claim a means for providing a communication session time limit, and means for altering the time limit in response to a predetermined condition.

Fleek fails to disclose or suggest means for providing a time limit to a communication session. As discussed above, a time limit to a communication session provides a maximum time that rights to a communication channel are available to a remote terminal. *Fleek*, in contrast, at most discusses a timeout period during which an acknowledgement is to be sent if a packet is received by a terminal. Furthermore, even if *Fleek's* acknowledgement timeout could be construed as a session time limit, which Applicants maintain it cannot be so construed, *Fleek* fails to disclose or suggest means for altering the time limit. Therefore, *Fleek* fails to disclose or suggest the invention as recited in claim 15.

Claims 16-23 and 25 depend from claim 15. Because dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that *Fleek* fails to anticipate these claims for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-3, 9-10, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fleek* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,374,112 issued to Widegren et al. (*Widegren*). Applicants submit that these claims are not rendered obvious by *Fleek* and *Widegren* for at least the following reasons.

Claims 2-3

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, discussed above. The Office Action cites *Widegren* for the proposition that a priority status associated with the remote user terminal causes a session renewal. Whether or not *Widegren* stands for the proposition asserted in the Office Action, which Applicants do not concede, *Widegren* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Fleek*. Specifically, *Fleek* and *Widegren*, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest detecting a session renewal and altering the session time limit in response to detecting the session renewal, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, no combination of *Fleek* and *Widegren* renders obvious the invention as set forth in claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1.

Claims 9-10

Claims 9-10 depend from claim 8, discussed above. The reasoning set forth above with respect to claim 8 applies equally well to these claims. Specifically, *Fleek* fails to disclose or suggest either lapse of a session time limit or determining if a session renewal has been generated, as recited in claim 8. Furthermore, whether or not *Widegren* stands for the proposition asserted in the Office Action, which Applicants do not concede, *Widegren* fails to

cure the deficiencies of *Fleek*. Thus, both *Widegren* and *Fleek*, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the invention as recited in claim 8.

Therefore, *Widegren* and *Fleek* cannot render obvious the invention as recited in claims 9 and 10, which depend from claim 8.

Claim 24

Claim 24 depends from claim 15, discussed above. Specifically, *Fleek* fails to disclose or suggest at least the limitations of means for providing a time limit to a communication session and means for altering the time limit, as recited in claim 15. Furthermore, whether or not *Widegren* discloses what is asserted in the Office Action, which Applicants do not concede, *Widegren* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Fleek*. Thus, both *Fleek* and *Widegren*, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 15. Therefore, *Fleek* and *Widegren* cannot render obvious claim 24, which depends from claim 15.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.